

June 18, 2009 (# 345)

Alan Watt "Cutting Through The Matrix" LIVE on RBN:

Poem Copyright Alan Watt June 18, 2009:

Bigotry of Autocracy Pirating Your Privacy:

"Canada and U.S. Both on Par,
Give Power to Cyber Warfare Czar,
To Keep Us Secure, Themselves in Primacy,
We Should Give Up the Quaint Idea of Privacy
Which Seems 'Passed Down from Ancient Custom,'
We Needn't Fear Tyrants, We've Evolved, Trust 'em,
The Category 'Essential Privacy' is to Exist
For Government, CIA and the Very Rich,
Everyone Else Should Go with the Tide,
You Don't Need Privacy, 'less You've Something to Hide,'
The Road to Hell Paved with Good Intention,
We're Locked in Information Security Detention"

© Alan Watt June 18, 2009

Poem & Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - June 18, 2009 (Exempting Music,
Literary Quotes, and Callers' Comments)

cuttingthroughthematrix.com

alternate sites:

cuttingthroughthematrix.net , .us , .ca

alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca

mirror site:

cuttingthrough.jenknness.com

European site includes all audios & downloadable TRANSCRIPTS in European
languages for print up:

alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

Information for purchasing Alan's books, CDs, DVDs and DONATIONS:

Canada and America: PayPal, Cash, personal checks &
for the US, **INTERNATIONAL** postal money orders / for Canada, INTERNAL postal
money orders
(America: Postal Money orders - Stress the **INTERNATIONAL** pink one, not the green
internal one.)

Outside the Americas: PayPal, Cash, Western Union and Money Gram
(Money Gram is cheaper; even cheaper is a Money Gram check - in Canadian dollars:
mail via the postal services worldwide.)

PayPal Orders: USE THE [DONATE](#) BUTTON ON THE WEBSITE - AND -
Send a separate email along with the donation (list your order, name and address)

Click the link below for your location (ordering info):

[USA](#)

[Canada](#)

[Europe/Scandinavian](#)

[All Other Countries](#)

Hi folks. I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix on the 18th of

June, 2009. For newcomers, look in to cuttingthroughthematrix.com web site and on the front page I have listed all the other sites I have. The reason being is that I've had trouble before with some servers who pulled me down. Lately, I've had a similar experience with Yahoo. I think there will be more problems in the future as cyber security tightens up. If you're not on the payroll or if you're not authorized to be out there, you'll be yanked off. Therefore, I've got other servers. On the front page at cuttingthroughthematrix.com you can see the other sites that I'm on. You should pick one to make it your favorite one and use them. That way, too, it spreads the bandwidth and the companies have less to complain about. Not that they should be complaining at all when you're paying for unlimited bandwidth. There's alanwattsentientsentinel.eu which has all of the audio that the others have PLUS it has written transcripts, as well, written in the various languages of Europe. So get used to trying these other sites as well. Plus, you might get through faster. If you all go in to the .com at the same time, you might get slow speed or something like that with too many people coming in to it. So it gives you an option.

Remember, too, that you keep me going by YOU, the listener, because I don't ask for money from the advertisers. That's generally how hosts make their cash and it's pretty lucrative too, but I don't do that. I depend upon YOU, the listeners, to buy what I have on cuttingthroughthematrix.com web site or donating to me by personal check or through PayPal. Personal checks are fine from the US and within Canada. PayPal is a good way to go. Eventually it will be the only way to go, I'm sure of that. Eventually, that's coming along at a clip. In fact, I have an article tonight on the cashless society. You can also use Western Union if you live outside of the Americas. OR you can be very ingenious and send cash the old-fashioned way. That's up to you. It tends to get through.

I should also mention that those who want to write to me can reach me at [listed above].

The mail eventually gets to me after the security have checked it all and so on. So far, I've found out that they haven't actually stolen anything, but they do put little bits of white, very white, almost translucent tape on the edges of their new envelopes.

We are going in... actually WE'RE UNDER MARTIAL LAW. We have been since 2001 and the world has gone in to it simultaneously because it was all prearranged, obviously. THE EXACT SAME ANTI-TERRORIST BILLS AND LAWS WENT IN TO EFFECT AT THE SAME TIME, IN EVERY COUNTRY, ACROSS THE PLANET. That's not a coincidence. Anyone who's studied bureaucracies - and there's different nations - will realize that anything that they do takes time. When it's intergovernmental, intercontinental agreements, THAT TAKES YEARS. I'll be back with more after these messages.

I am Alan Watt, we're Cutting Through The Matrix, just mentioning the fact that the coordination after 2001 between nations doesn't happen just like that. Bureaucracies take *years* to get anything done... under any circumstances. When there was so much intensive cooperation and the fact that they all unrolled the same agenda, in every nation across the planet at the same time, tells you that all this was prepared YEARS in advance. Years in advance. We have been really under marital law, a more open form of martial law, since 2001 to the present

time.

Right after 2001, the press went overboard. You can always get little clues, you see, that they've been told to do something or how to present something to the public until we get some sort of *subliminal message* implanted in our skulls. EVERY station that you looked in to, every TV station, would do its man in the street thing after the news, at the end of the news, asking the man and woman in the street if they wouldn't mind giving up their freedom for security. This was ad nauseam, night after night on ALL the stations. So you KNEW they were trying to get a point across to the public. You see, tyranny has always used the same excuse to take away people's freedoms down through history. Even in ancient Rome they had all these techniques worked out. But it was always *presented* to the public as a method of keeping them safe.

Here's an article here to do with cyber war. What it really is, it's a total invasion of privacy, giving authority to ALL factions of military, police, etc and intelligence to spy on everyone, under the guise of freedom and security. This is from the spectrum.ieee.org. I'll put the links up on my site at the end of the show, along with the audio.

The Risk Factor **Will US Cyberwar Plan Compromise Privacy?**

POSTED BY: Robert Charette // Tue, June 16, 2009 // (spectrum.ieee.org)

On the 29th of March, President Obama said that his administration would "pursue a new comprehensive approach to securing America's digital infrastructure."

In fact, the President promised that the "digital infrastructure -- the networks and computers we depend on every day -- will be treated as they should be: as a strategic national asset. (*Alan: Strategy.*) Protecting this infrastructure will be a national security priority. (*A: So, it's to be done for protecting you, you see.*) We will ensure that these networks are secure, trustworthy and resilient. We will deter, prevent, detect, and defend against attacks (*A: That's a beautiful legal statement. I don't know if you've ever watched lawyers for government going over treaties they've signed with a fine-tooth comb to REDEFINE certain words or phrases for loopholes. They do this with everything. So...*) defend against attacks and recover quickly from any disruptions or damage." (*A: Attacks can be defined as anything. What I'm saying could be construed as an attack... or what I put up on the internet.*)

Furthermore, the President said, "Let me also be clear about what we will not do. (*A: We know what politicians are. They're famous for a prominent gift.*) Our pursuit of cybersecurity will not -- I repeat, will not include -- monitoring private sector networks or Internet traffic. We will preserve and protect the personal privacy and civil liberties that we cherish as Americans."

Noble promise, but as a story on the new Pentagon's cyber command over the weekend in the New York Times notes, the reality may be much different.

The Times story says that "There is simply no way, the [defense] officials say, to effectively conduct computer operations without entering networks inside

the United States, where the military is prohibited from operating, or traveling electronic paths through countries that are not themselves American targets."

Therefore, the story states that, "Some administration officials have begun to discuss whether laws or regulations must be changed to allow law enforcement, the military or intelligence agencies greater access to networks or Internet providers when significant evidence of a national security threat was found." (A: *So there again, all they had to say - as there's so much negative propaganda, DAMAGING propaganda, out there - that THAT'S significant evidence for them to go in and do something about it. This is the kind of terminology lawyers love.*)

Of course, what "significant evidence" means remains open to interpretation. Too often in the past, the government's claims of significant evidence of a threat has been similar in veracity as reports of crop circles.

The upshot, the Times says, is that Americans' privacy and civil liberties may have to be compromised in order to protect the US digital infrastructure. (A: *This is where they're going with all this. We have to rethink what privacy is. In fact, we have to rethink if we even NEED it. Now, they've been retraining the public for years that privacy doesn't matter. A generation is growing up now that thinks it's quite normal to give all your data to anyone who asks for it.*)

This should not really be a surprise to anyone, however.

As we noted here in November of 2007, the then Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence, Dr. Donald Kerr, was telling anyone willing to listen that American's long held expectations of privacy had to change, and that in essence, **privacy was whatever the government declared it to be**: (A: *There's a link from this site to that actual article from November 2007. Remember, that was the Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence, Dr. Donald Kerr, right, who says, he was telling anyone willing to listen that American's long held expectations of privacy had to change, and that in essence, **privacy was whatever the government declared it to be**.*)

"We need to move beyond the construct that equates anonymity with privacy and focus more on how we can protect essential privacy in this interconnected environment... (A: *What's essential privacy? Well, essential privacy is what government is doing and what the various snoopers on you, all these agencies, are doing. That's what's called essential privacy. You're not essential.*) Instead, privacy, I would offer, is a system of laws, rules, and customs (A: *It's just your custom, you see.*) with an infrastructure of Inspectors General, oversight committees, and privacy boards on which our intelligence community commitment is based and measured." (A: *But really, as I say, you have no essential privacy. You're not in that category.*)

Given the Times story, sounds like more and more we all should be prepared to do an Esan Elahi. (A: *So there you go. We know what's coming down the pike.*)

We know what's coming down the pike. We're going to redefine privacy. It says it's an old custom, just an old custom that we used to have and *we've evolved* since we needed it. We don't need that anymore because the people who now take care of you, in Socialism, LOVE YOU and they're evolved. They're more evolved than the old kind of socialists, you see. That's what they're telling you.

I WONDER IF WE'LL EVER, EVER LEARN FROM THE PAST, eh? Most people can't even remember the past, even in their own lifetime, even the recent past.

Now, we, really, at this level of intelligence, as they say, intelligence gathering, at the bottom level, are never IN on what's really happening on anything. Never, ever. It's the same with all the wars going across the world right now and the US army and the British armies all over the place. It's all do with the oil countries as they loot those countries and, as they say, they *must make sure they keep their hegemony for the future*. The US and Britain must keep this power structure up until about 2050 at least. So they're, in a sense, in one part, they're keeping their present system going for another 50-odd years.

It's also to do with standardization of those countries in to the one, same, secularized society. Why? Because they can do *business* with secularized societies. It's easy to pay them off. Secularized societies called democracy are *utterly corrupt* these days. That's all over even the British papers, article after article with the politicians filling their pockets with the taxpayers' money. The cops, even, who are assigned to special units to do with anti-terrorism, putting everything down on their expense accounts. Thousands and thousands of pounds. 40,000 pounds at a time, sometimes... in one night. That kind of stuff. THAT HOW DEMOCRACIES WORK... ON CORRUPTION.

We're never, really, in on the big picture on *any level*. That's part of the job of psy-ops - psychological operations - is never to allow the public to be in on what's really, really happening. We're kept out of the picture. When we're given a reason for something, it's never the REAL reason, never. We know, for instance, that there was a big scare after 2001 when anthrax envelopes, or letters, were mailed off to prominent people in the US. Then after about 2 years of investigations and blaming people across the waters, their own inspectors said it came, they suspect, from Fort Detrick, in the US, which is run by the United States army. Here's an article here and it's from The Washington Post. Now, who knows the whole story here. As I say, we'll never know anything... except what they tell us.

FORT DETRICK

Inventory Uncovers 9,200 More Pathogens

Laboratory Says Security Is Tighter, but Earlier Count Missed

Dangerous Vials

FBI investigators concluded that Fort Detrick probably was the source of the anthrax spores used in the deadly mailings of 2001.

By Nelson Hernandez

Washington Post Staff Writer

Thursday, June 18, 2009

An inventory of potentially deadly pathogens at Fort Detrick's infectious disease laboratory (A: *Remember that they're in to bacterial and viral*

warfare.) found more than 9,000 vials (A: *This is DEADLY pathogens.*) that had not been accounted for, Army officials said yesterday, raising concerns that officials wouldn't know whether dangerous toxins were missing. (A: *I'll read more of this after this break.*)

I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix, reading an article from The Washington Post concerning Fort Detrick who have lost an awful lot of their deadly vials that they experiment with. This article goes on to say

After four months of searching about 335 freezers and refrigerators at the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases in Frederick (A: *I love what they call it. It's a RESEARCH institute of INFECTIOUS DISEASES.*), investigators found 9,220 samples that hadn't been included in a database of about 66,000 items listed as of February, said Col. Mark Kortepeter, the institute's deputy commander.

The vials contained some dangerous pathogens, among them the Ebola virus, anthrax bacteria and botulinum toxin, and less lethal agents such as Venezuelan equine encephalitis virus and the bacterium that causes tularemia. Most of them, forgotten inside freezer drawers, hadn't been used in years or even decades. Officials said some serum samples from hemorrhagic fever patients dated to the Korean War.

Kortepeter likened the inventory to cleaning out the attic (A: *That's all it is.*) and said he knew of no plans for an investigation into how the vials had been left out of the database. "The vast majority of these samples were working stock that were accumulated over decades," he said, left there by scientists who had retired or left the institute.

"I can't say that nothing did [leave the lab], but I can say that we think it's extremely unlikely," Kortepeter said. (A: *Well, that's very comforting.*)

Still, the overstock and the previous inaccuracy of the database raised the possibility that someone could have taken a sample outside the lab with no way for officials to know something was missing.

"Nine thousand, two hundred undocumented samples is an extraordinarily serious breach," said Richard H. Ebright, a professor at Rutgers University who follows biosecurity. "A small number would be a concern; 9,200 . . . at an institution that has been the focus of intense scrutiny on this issue, that's deeply worrisome. Unacceptable."

The institute has been under pressure to tighten security in the wake of the 2001 anthrax attacks (A: *That's where they were posted off to different people in the US.*), which killed five people and sickened 17. FBI investigators say they think the anthrax strain used in the attacks originated at the Army lab, and its prime suspect, Bruce E. Ivins, researched anthrax there. Ivins committed suicide last year during an investigation into his activities. (A: *It's amazing that every one of these that they put all the blame on ends up committing suicide, eh? But it's true. You see, they can tell exactly which lab created which particular toxin. They came up with the fact that it was DEFINITELY THAT ONE, from THAT laboratory that had been sent across.*)

Now, HOW was that sent across to these prominent people inside the US? Who did it? Why aren't they trying to find out who did it? Instead of saying well, this guy's dead now, we think it might have been him. That's just too down pat. That stinks. That stinks to high heaven.)

Kortepeter noted that since 2001 the lab has imposed multiple layers of security to check people entering and leaving, that there are now cameras in the labs, and that employees are subjected to a reliability program and random inspections. (A: *Etc, etc, etc.*)

As I've always said, we don't have to worry about other people. You always find that things go back to government or the high spook agencies, like the CIA. That's what you always find. Quite something.

There's another article here, which I've mentioned to people before. IF YOU JOIN THE MILITARY, YOU ARE A GUINEA PIG... AND YOU'RE ALSO DISPOSABLE. I've read various articles on the testing of various things on soldiers down through the decades. Again, after 30, 40, 50 years, they declassify stuff and we all... well, most folk don't care, to be honest with you. Because that generation's generally dead or dying off and the next generation doesn't care. That's why they always declassify it in about 50 years. No one cares. But personally, I don't think most folk care at the time unless stuff is raining down on them, PERSONALLY. This is from London, Ontario. It's an article from Ecospective.

ECOSPECTIVE: Londoner calls for inquiry into Gagetown Agent Orange

Daniel O'Neail, Special to LondonTopic.ca 05/12/2008

With the PCB (polychlorinated biphenyls) issue still so fresh in everyone's mind I thought this would be a good time to remind people that there have been other instances of public exposure to harmful chemicals, and at least one member of our community is trying to do something for those who were exposed to at least one of those toxins.

Art Connolly, is a resident of London, and has been actively attempting to raise people's awareness of the dangers and effects of Agent Orange. (A: *Everybody remembers Agent Orange because it had some incredible consequences on the soldiers that it rained down upon. They tried so hard to hush all that up.*)

In 2005 the story broke of how the U.S. military (A: *With an agreement, obviously, with the Canadian government.*) had sprayed the CFB Gagetown (A: *That's near the New Brunswick area.*) area with Agent Orange in 1966 and 1967... (A: *I think that's the music so I'll come back with this story after these messages.*)

I am Alan Watt. We're Cutting Through The Matrix, reading an article from Ecospective magazine to do with the US military spraying Agent Orange within Canada. If they were doing it at the Canadian Forces Base Gagetown, I imagine they were doing it the across the country at all the other bases as well. These bases, remember, have married quarters IN them but they also have little towns that grow up around them. These towns service them. They supply the cleaners

and so on and all the people who work inside the base during the day. Their families are all living just on the perimeter of the base in these little towns. Some not so little.

In 2005 the story broke of how the U.S. military had sprayed the CFB Gagetown area with Agent Orange in 1966 and 1967 and the possible health risks to the soldiers and their families who had been there at the time. (A: *This is when they first admitted to it, right, and this fellow here, he says...*)

Connolly was watching this story on the news when his sister called to tell him his father's health had deteriorated and he was not likely to live much longer.

Sitting in the hospital during the last few hours of his father's life Connolly began to put the pieces together.

He and his family had lived on the base from 1957 to 69, His brother had died of Reyes at age 7, he'd lost a sister to a pulmonary embolism, she was 28, his mother had stomach cancer, and even his last remaining sister had reproductive issues.

With his father dying Connolly began to question if the time at CFB Gagetown was responsible.

When he returned home after the funeral he started a website called agentorangealert.com (see link) in a quest for answers – and answers he got.

The site received more than three million hits over the last three years and within a short time it was discovered that the 66-67 spraying was only a small part of the problem. Documents found under the freedom of information act revealed that the Canadian military had been spraying the area since 1956, and the records showed regular spraying up till 1984 of chemical 24D and 245T. These are numeric terms for the components of Agent Orange, and contain dioxins.

From 1956 to 1984 1.3 million liters and 1 million kilograms of dry defoliating agent had been dropped on Gagetown to maintain a training area. The area for treatment was outlined (A: *They actually marked the outline for spraying with soldiers who stood with little flags so that the pilots could see them.*) by soldiers holding marker stakes, watching while the toxins rained down upon them.

One local civilian wrote to Connolly recalling how all the birds in her farmyard lay dead and quiet, in eerie similarity to the book *Silent Spring* by Rachel Carson, before she and her family were forced to move out of the area.

Over 450,000 Canadian troops passed through CFB Gagetown (A: *That's ONE base, remember.*), exposing themselves and their families to the toxins distributed throughout the landscape. And while the spraying of 66-67 is being acknowledged, this provides for only 1% of the exposed personnel. The rest of the estimated 1 million people put at risk have not received recognition, much less an apology.

The government tends to do the same thing always with this. They wait until they simply die off. It's that easy. That's what they do. I watched when the tainted blood scandal was done, when Bill Clinton signed the deal with Canada that allowed all the various prisoners in certain American prisons to sell their blood. It was given to hemophiliacs in Canada. Guess what happened? They all came down with awful diseases and started dying off like flies. The Canadian government had one of their fantastic inquiries. These drag on for years. That's their purpose. After about 9 years, I think, most of the people were dead anyway. Then, they came to their conclusion. That is standard. They wait to see how many are left and if there's one or two left, they can give them a payment. It's all economics. You see that's what we are. We're economic factors... and so were all these troops that passed through CFB Gagetown. The government will wait until they're all dead, long dead, before they come out with the true figures on that. As I say, we know almost nothing at the bottom... of any reality... at all. Any reality at all.

Now, I've mentioned before, too, I read an article last week about the cashless society coming. Now, the big wigs are starting to mention this openly, as well. *When they speak we should listen.* This article is from news.com.au.

Cash to become extinct as chips take off

By Anthony Keane / The Advertiser / June 15, 2009

Bank bosses have predicted the decline of cash as transactions are done through microchips.

CASH is accelerating down the path to extinction as new technologies threaten to mark the end of loose change within a decade. *(A: They're actually saying this. Within a decade they're going to go cashless.)*

Bank and credit union bosses say cash won't be alone, with wallets and credit cards also likely to disappear too.

They told The Advertiser's round table forum that cash and cards will be replaced by computer chips embedded *(A: Listen to this...)* in mobile phones, watches or other portable devices.

Australian Central chief executive Peter Evers believes cash will be replaced for most transactions in five-to-seven years. *(A: Not 10.)*

"Cash will disappear as there will be other forms of carrying cash, stored value in your phone or whatever it might be. *(A: They know exactly what it's going to be, because this was decided YEARS ago obviously.)* It will transfer automatically," he said. *(A: That's what they do, of course, with these implanted chips. When you go in to these clubs across Europe - that just happen to be opened by a guy who worked for the NSA - and they embed you with a chip if you want to become a member. They'll charge the chip with so-much credits and you don't have to use cash at all. The youngsters think it's just fantastic. So, they're going to do the same thing with your cell phone, etc.)*

"We're very close in countries around the world. If you go in to Hong Kong

(A: *This is where we should watch, you see, because things come out in the Far East faster, electronic-wise, and they USE them quicker than they do across the West.*) or Singapore, the low-value transactions have already disappeared. You can't go anywhere, like on public transport, without pre-purchasing a card.

"I think the Australian Payment Systems Board is very much on top of it and is trying to move down a path, but hasn't publicly put things into place yet."

Bank SA general manager strategy and operations Chris Ward expects Australia to follow the offshore lead, with small cash transactions disappearing first. (A: *That's how it is going to go... with small transactions.*)

"So you can't go and buy a bottle of water from the deli with cash; you've got to go and buy it with your chip," he said.

Bendigo and Adelaide Bank state manager SA/NT John Oliver said it was easier for retailers to use electronic transactions than manual cash transactions.

Savings & Loans chief executive Greg Connor said the concept of the wallet would go.

"Whereas now we have a wallet and purse, it will be a chip in your phone or your watch or something like that as your access," he said. (A: *Guess where it will go eventually? You know there's going to be a spate of robberies or whatever to do with your phones. Whatever is charged with your credits is going to be stolen. And you know they're going to eventually give you the chip and say this is much safer until they start hacking your arms off. [laughs]*)

Mr Evers said credit cards were on the way out as well.

"The access to credit is still going to be there through the mobile phone, but you don't need the card because that's really only a means of identification," he said.

"There could be another way of identifying, but the product, revolving credit, will still sit there."

This is starting to go... within about 7 years... it's going to be here. They'll do massive campaigns on television. It will be in sitcoms and in movies and so on to get everyone used to the idea because everyone emulates TV and so on. They know that. Plato said that. That's why everyone in ancient Greece had EVERYONE - when the local players came in, or not so much local but came in locally from another town or country, these traveling players - everyone had to BY LAW attend the plays. Because IT WAS THROUGH WHAT YOU SAW ON THE STAGE THAT YOU EMULATE IN TO YOUR CULTURE. It *becomes* your culture. It *updates* your culture. They wrote about that technique BACK THEN, *all that time ago*. People DO emulate what they see on TV. They try to *become* what they see on TV. *IT DOES WORK*.

I've gone through the Bernays history, to an extent, and how this guy was brought in - this relative of Freud - to basically create the American culture of consumerism. You could make the people believe ANYTHING at all. According to one of the videos that are up there with his sister talking, he HATED THE PUBLIC because they were so *easily manipulated*. He despised them. I've said that about the psychopath. They despise the victim that's so easily used. Despise them. Hate them.

Here's how young women are being lured in to bankruptcy by celebrity lifestyle stuff on television. This is from The Telegraph.

Young women 'lured into bankruptcy by celebrity lifestyle'

Young women who copy the lifestyles of celebrities such as Paris Hilton or footballers' wives such as Victoria Beckham are behind a surge in female bankruptcies, according to a study.

By Alastair Jamieson // Published: 17 Jun 2009

The research, based on figures that show the majority of bankrupts under 24 are now female, concluded that women succumb to the temptation for spending sprees as they assert their independence. *(A: This is the excuse they're giving for it.)*

Last year 55 per cent of young bankrupts were female, compared to 48 per cent five years ago. In total, 1,560 women under 24 were declared bankrupt compared to 1,250 men in the same age group.

Many young women have become trapped in debt because they buy designer clothes and accessories to display the "trappings of success", the study said. *(A: They're trying to emulate what they see on television. And that's all they're FED on television. How they're supposed to look, how thin they should be, etc, what they should wear. That's called success to them, you see.)*

The research, based on data from The Insolvency Service, found that young women were keener than young men to demonstrate their independence by renting or owning their own flat.

Anthony Cork, of accountancy firm Wilkins Kennedy which compiled the research, told the Daily Mail: "Five years ago it tended to be young men who got out of their financial depth, but now it is far more likely to be young women who spend irresponsibly.

"That gap between the genders seems to be growing. Over the last decade, the pressure on young women to follow the lavish lifestyle of female celebrities has grown immensely.

"In all seriousness we are told that Paris Hilton and Victoria Beckham are role models to be followed. *(A: EVERYONE you see on there is a role model to be followed. That's what the culture industry is. Do you remember the Spice Girls? The ones that were picked up and put together as a team. I've no*

doubt at all the songs were written before they were even picked and they were told how many hits they would have and then they'd fade away. That's pretty standard. What do you think they were portraying? They said their main audience, their target group, was about 8 to 12 years olds. Did you ever see any of the videos they put out there? What do you think THAT was all for? ...as they sat splay-legged on chairs with no clothes on? Monkey see, monkey do, eh? You wonder why the culture is in the mess it's in. The people who give it to you KNOW what they're doing. They must destroy all that was to bring in the new, the new society.) The growing availability of credit has meant that for the status-conscious, who want to exhibit the trappings of success, designer clothes and jewellery seem misleadingly achievable."

According to official figures, 29 per cent of all 20 to 34-year-olds now live with their parents, compared to just 18 per cent of women of the same age group.

Last year, around **67,500 people in all age groups went personally bankrupt** in England and Wales, an increase of **89 per cent** over the past five years. (A: *Mind you too, you got to understand that a lot have lost their jobs as well.*)

Overall, those over the age of 45 are the most likely to go bankrupt, as falling house prices and rising unemployment reduces their ability to manage debt, according to Wilkins Kennedy.

Almost 40 per cent of those declared bankrupt last year were over 45, with bankruptcy in this age group more than doubling in the past five years, from 10,594 in 2004 to 23,767 last year.

Just work hard, son, just work hard and stick at that job all your life and get a house and that's your security for the future, son. Ho-ho! Boy, we're schmucks eh? We're schmucks. When people at the top, with a stroke of a pen, can bring everything down and you'll never even see their faces. That's the reality of the world.

I've mentioned too, that whatever they do at the top or whatever they say, you can take it to the bank - THAT won't go bankrupt - because they never change their plans. THEY DO TELL YOU IN ADVANCE WHAT THEY'RE GOING TO DO. I've talked before about the domed cities. I met one of the guys who was in to designing them back in the 80s. I mentioned too that Prince Charles was on HIS polo team, not the other way around. People laugh at this idea and pooh-pooh it, etc. Well, here's from a Houston newspaper.

Experts Say Houston Dome May Help Environment

hulic.com - June 9, 2009

The science of mega engineering says we can save Houston (A: *Houston is very hot and humid. It always has been.*) with a Dome. Imagine building a huge Dome that covers the entire city, that is higher than Houston's skyscrapers.

One solution to counter the almost overwhelming environmental challenges

facing Houston is to cover it with a giant geodesic dome. You can watch the video at the Discovery channel and explore how a giant geodesic dome may save the city from a grim environmental future.

Houston is in peril. The country's fourth most populous city faces heat, hurricanes and other natural disasters. (A: *It always has.*) Houston has always been vulnerable to hurricanes and severe weather.

Houston city center shut down for nearly a week from last year's hurricane. It caused the city a 10 billion dollar damage. It's not only the hurricanes, but also heat and humidity that keep oppressing this great city. On nearly 100 days each year the temperature climbs above 90 degrees.

Air conditioning helps, but it comes at a very high cost. Houston is using more electricity than Los Angeles.

This is why some scientists think the only way to save the city is to move it indoors (A: *MOVE THE CITY INDOORS.*), in other words to build a huge dome for Houston. Houston dome area will stretch over 21 Million square feet, making it the biggest structure with the largest roof in the world. (A: *Well it will be until they do the next city. That's the music coming in. I'll read more on this article after I come back from this break.*)

Hi folks. I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix, continuing with an article about the building of the first, I guess, domed city and apparently they picked Houston for this project.

Houston Dome's broadest panels will be 15 feet across. It will take 147,000 panels to cover the city of Houston. Glass will not work for Houston Dome. (A: *Then it goes in to the fabrication of this stuff that they will use, etc and the companies that will be involved.*)

Since it's not possible to stop the life in Houston to build the Dome an army of dirigibles will be used to complete the construction.

Houston Dome will take years of construction and billions of dollars. The Dome is designed to protect a city from a category-5 hurricane. The ETFE panels and the space-frame steel structure that supports them are the key. (A: *Then it goes on to push up how fantastic these materials actually are.*) ETFE can withstand winds of 180 miles per hour. This is higher velocity than the strongest category 5 hurricane.

Houston Dome idea is very intriguing. But I am just left with one idea. Will Houston ever see rain? If no, is it possible to sustain an ecosystem of such a size without rain?

So they will go ahead with these projects. I was thinking today about that big experiment they had. I don't know if it was in the 70s or 80s. Where they hired a bunch of youngsters and various couples to live inside a dome in the country somewhere. Then they wrote a book about it and how they sustained themselves by growing everything themselves and eating their own produce and how it was, basically, self-sustaining. Then afterwards, after the book was out and the various

wildlife funds made a hoopla about how wonderful this was, the characters who were involved in the project, the volunteers, admitted they were sneaking out every night from the beginning, down to the pizza restaurants and the burger joints and getting friends to smuggle stuff up to them. So they were eating their usual stuff after all.

Socialism is great for depersonalization of people. It doesn't see people as individuals with hopes and dreams and expectations and families and loves and different personalities. It just sees a mass of numbers. This article, to close off the show, is from The Telegraph.

Social policy 'ruining childhood'

Childhood is being undermined by a string of "oppressive demands" from ministers *(A: They call them ministers over there, not politicians.)*
disguised as social policy, experts have claimed.

By Graeme Paton, Education Editor
17 Jun 2009

Academics said legislation introduced over the last 20 years increasingly cast children and their families **as numbers** rather than real people.

It meant their needs were being shunned in favour of targets that could be easily measured, it was claimed.

Researchers from the University of the West of England, Bristol, criticised policies such as Labour's new curriculum for under fives.

The Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) - which must be followed by all state and private childminders, nurseries and pre-schools - sets out a series of 69 "learning goals" including literacy, numeracy and problem-solving.

You see, we're all supposed to be standardized. Every child is different. Some mature better than others in certain areas and quicker. Others mature and take over and go very fast later. However, we're all supposed to be the same in the socialist, bureaucratic mindset. It's sad, isn't it? Anyway, I'll put all these links up on my site at the end of the show. So look in there. Read them up for yourselves. Quite interesting.

From Hamish and myself in Ontario, Canada and may your God or your Gods *GO* with you.

Topics of show covered in following links:

["Will US Cyberwar Plan Compromise Privacy?" by Robert Charette \(spectrum.ieee.org\) - June 16, 2009.](http://spectrum.ieee.org)

["FORT DETRICK - Inventory Uncovers 9,200 More Pathogens" by Nelson Hernandez \(washingtonpost.com\) - June 18, 2009.](http://washingtonpost.com)

["ECOSPECTIVE: Londoner calls for inquiry into Gagetown Agent Orange" by Daniel O'Neil \(at wiseupjournal.com\) - May 12, 2008.](#)

["Agent Orange Alert" \(agentorangealert.com\).](#)

"Cash to become extinct as chips take off" by Anthony Keane (news.com.au) - June 15, 2009. (See Above-mentioned Article)

["Young women 'lured into bankruptcy by celebrity lifestyle' " by Alastair Jamieson \(telegraph.co.uk\) - June 17, 2009.](#)

["Experts Say Houston Dome May Help Environment" \(huliq.com\) - June 9, 2009.](#)

["Social policy 'ruining childhood' " by Graeme Paton \(telegraph.co.uk\) - June 17, 2009.](#)

Transcribed by Diana